



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

became *Nánnētes*, whence Nantes. So *Nemāūsus* > *Némaūsus* > Nîmes; and *Tricāsses* > Tricasses > Troyes. This last accentuation is attested by the rhythmic clausula in Ammianus Marcellinus. On the other hand some earlier short penults became accented: Compare *Bellóvāci* > *Bellovāci* > Beauvais. All place names in *-ācum* and *-ācum* were so accented.

Celtic influence on the Gallic phonology is claimed for the following:

(1) The pronunciation *ū* as *ü*, as is prevalent today in France, Northern Portugal, in some parts of Northern Italy and in Western Raetia, is still regarded by some scholars as having been the result of Celtic influence, but the claim is denied by others.

(2) The nasalization of vowels, which has become so thoroughly characteristic of the French, occurs only where Celtic influence appears: Compare e.g. *rationem* > Fr. *raison*, Port. *razaõ*; *bonum* > Fr. *bon*, Port. *bõ*.

(3) Thurneysen assigns to Celtic influence the tendency of the Gallic Latin to diphthongize Lat. *ē* to *oi*: Compare e.g. *rēgem* > *roi*; *legem* > *loi*.

(4) The loss of intervocalic, *t*, *d*, *g*: Compare e.g. *Augústum* > *août*; *audire* > *ouïr*; *lēgere* > *lire*.

(5) The Latin combination *-ct-* acts similarly in France and Northern Portugal. The phenomenon is the same as that of the Celtic *ct* becoming *it* through a *-cht-*: compare e.g. Lat. *lāctem* > Gallic Latin *lachte* > Fr. *lait*.

Very little is known of the effect of the Celtic on the Gallic Latin inflections. The nominative in *-os* is common on Gallic inscriptions alongside of *-us*.

One instance of the Celtic influence on Gallic Latin syntax may be the use of the preposition *ad* (Fr. *à*) even nowadays to indicate possession. Thurneysen (Archiv 7. 523) affirms that the use of *inter* to express a reciprocal relation is peculiar to the French dialects and that this Latin preposition was called into service to make up for the want of a preposition corresponding in function to a native Celtic preposition equivalent to the Latin *ambi*. Geyer (Archiv 8. 482) cites from the old Salic Formulae *inter nos interdonare* where *interdonare* is shown to be Vulgar Latin by the many attempts to avoid it by circumlocution.

Brunot notes that the French say *c'est moi qui*, *c'est toi qui*, but that this is not Latin. In some Celtic dialects the verb is conjugated by means of this periphrase.

There are many peculiarities of the Gallic Latin syntax as found on inscriptions and in the late Gallic Latin writers but they are not always demonstrably of Celtic origin.

The number of Celtic words which came into the Gallic Latin vocabulary must have been considerable in the early period. About a hundred are thought to have been preserved in French. Some

are certainly Celtic and have Gallic Latin corroboration: compare e.g. *alauda* > *alouette*. Other Celtic words came into Latin before the Latin was taken from Italy to Gaul. Some non-Latin words in French are probably Celtic, others only suspected to be so.

The Gallic inscriptions published by Pirson show that Gallic Latin preserved in this form is not very different from what the Latin of Italy of the same class must have been at the same time. The study by Groeber in the early volumes of the Archiv of the stock of Vulgar Latin words preserved in the several Romance Languages reveals something like a hundred Vulgar Latin words which survived in the Latin of Gaul alone. These must therefore be considered to have had a peculiarly strong hold in Gaul. For example: elsewhere the word for house is *casa*, in Gaul it was *mansio* (Fr. *maison*); *casa* does not appear in the Gallic Latin, but the form *casus* survives in the preposition *chez*.

Again, a study of the style of the Gallo-Roman writers—Marcellus Empiricus, Sulpicius Severus, Sidonius Apollinaris, Salvianus, and Gregory of Tours—shows similar lexicographical peculiarities. Marcellus and Sidonius use *carminare* (Fr. *charmer*), which is Gallic Latin; in Italian and Spanish Latin the word used was *incantare*.

Furthermore, within the Gallic province itself some different forms were favored. In Gaul *piscio* (*poisson*) and *messio* (*moisson*) were used, elsewhere *piscis* and *messis*. In the North of Gaul often a different form was current from that found in the South: e.g. in the North we find *nivicare*; in the South *nivare*. Similarly we find *strenna* and *strena*. Pages 311-399 of Bourciez, *Éléments de linguistique romane*, give many examples of the different changes and uses in the course of the dual development of the Vulgar Latin in Gaul.

UNION COLLEGE.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

## REVIEW

Marcus Tullius Cicero: Seven Orations, with Selections from the Letters, De Senectute, and Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, Grammatical Appendix, and Prose Composition, by Walter B. Gunnison and Walter S. Harley. New York: Silver, Burdett & Company (1912). Pp. xlii + 501.

This book is like the edition of Caesar by the same authors, in that it is designed to be a complete text-book for the year. Its general appearance is prepossessing and it contains an exceptionally large number of excellent illustrations. Many of the grammatical statements, also, are notably clear and concise, but the book, as a whole, is so full of major and minor blemishes that it is hard to see how it can prove very satisfactory to a scholarly and conscientious teacher.

We read, in the introduction, that Cicero "was elected quaestor at 30 and praetor at 39"; ten lines below reference is made to "his quaestorship in 75 B.C. and his praetorship in 67". Here also *liberti* is defined as "freed slaves", and *libertini* as "their descendants", but on page 238 *libertini* is translated by "freedmen".

We read also, in the introduction, that "*municipia* were conquered communities, without suffrage"; in the notes on the Oration for Archias they are described as "towns enjoying full citizenship rights".

In the somewhat voluminous notes much space is wasted in the statement of obvious facts and the translation of easy words and phrases, such as "*voluntas*: desire"; "*magno opere*: greatly"; "*industriæ subsidia*: aids of industry". On the other hand, in the case of some of the harder passages, the translation simply offers an easy way out of a difficulty, and often serves merely to obviate the need of thought on the part of the student. Many words and phrases are translated which would better be looked for in the Vocabulary. Thus *quamquam* is three times translated 'and yet'.

The note on *nostro omnium interitu* reads "we should expect *nostri*", and reference is made to a similar note on *nostra caede*. Only two reasons immediately suggest themselves why we should not expect *nostri*. One is that this form is almost invariably an objective genitive, which suits *caede* but not *interitu*. The other is that with *omnium* the form is always *nostrum*, not *nostri*.

The subjunctive of attraction is badly overworked, even subordinate clauses in indirect discourse being thus explained.

The footnotes to the Oration for Marcellus, which is included for sight translation, should presumably give the meaning of the less common words, and of those whose meaning cannot easily be inferred; but we find such notes as these: "*sollicitudine*: anxiety"; "*domina*: mistress"; "*adfirmo*: assert"; "*sanitatis*: good sense"; "*commemorabile*: memorable"; "*pertinacia*: obstinacy"; "*fortuitum*: accidental". We note also such un-Latin phrases as a *abhorre*, a *aliena*, *de sumpserit*.

In the first seventeen composition exercises, the word *Roman* occurs eight times without any suggestion as to Latin order. Then, in Lesson XVIII, a foot-note reads: "the Latin phrase reverses the order, *populus Romanus*". In Lesson XXIII a similar note reads: "the adjective *Romanus* regularly follows its noun"; and again, in Lesson XXVI, we have: "order: *knight* *Roman*". The student is also instructed to translate "declare war" by *inferre bellum*, and to use *omnibus* in the dative, in the sense of "everything".

Some of the translations seem a bit unpolished: "unless prudence had been taken from this great

audacity"; "it is doubtful to no one that the general is preëminent"; "retired spots" (*recessus* (*in animis*)); "says greeting" (*salutem dicit*). "Undeserved praise", for *vera laus*, is, of course, pure carelessness, but even carelessness goes beyond bounds in "the gladiators, whom he thought would be a most faithful band".

Of more importance, however, than unfortunate translations are certain loose or inaccurate statements in the Appendix, of which the following are examples:

"A possessive or descriptive genitive may be used in the predicate: *unum genus est eorum*". *Eorum* is neither possessive nor descriptive.

"Dative of personal nouns, instead of the genitive: *nullus est portis custos*". *Portis* is hardly a personal noun, and the dative is one of possession or reference.

"Ablative of comparison following a comparative adjective, etc.: *vita mea carior*". The ablative regularly *precedes*, as here.

Under Possessive Pronouns, it is stated that "the ablative of a possessive pronoun may be used in place of the objective genitive of a personal pronoun: *nostra* (= *nostri*) *caede*". Why limit this to the ablative case? or to the objective genitive, when the possessive so much more frequently is equivalent to the subjective genitive?

"An adjective or a pronoun limiting a noun in the locative case is put in the genitive".

"After *accedit*, it is added, or *accidit*, it happens, either a *quod*-clause, or a subjunctive *ut*-clause may be used, though *accidit* usually takes an *ut*-clause". An illustration of *accidit quod* would seem in order.

"The present infinitive denotes the same time as the principal verb". This is a common, though very inaccurate statement. Outside of indirect discourse and allied constructions the present infinitive has no more tense force than a gerund. With *iubeo*, and *memini*, and often with *volo*, it clearly does not denote the same time as the principal verb.

"Noun clauses with *quin*, if a negative is expressed or implied, are used after verbs meaning *doubt*, *be ignorant*". So rare and so uncertain a usage does not belong in a summary like this. *Quin* with verbs meaning *be ignorant* is extremely rare, and no instances are found in the Caesar and the Cicero usually read. Three instances of the normal construction with the infinitive may here be noted from preparatory Latin: Cat. I.15, *esse neminem qui nesciat* . . . *stetisse*; De Lege Man. 33, *an vero ignoratis portum Caietae* . . . *esse direptum*? De Lege Man. 15 *Vehementer autem pertinere* . . . *quid hostes existent* *quis ignorat*?

It is unfortunate that such demand as undoubtedly exists for a text-book of this inclusive character should not be met more satisfactorily.

PHILLIPS ACADEMY, Andover. BERNARD M. ALLEN.